United Nations A/C.3/59/SR.54

General Assembly
Fifty-ninth session
Official Records

Distr. General
30 November 2004
English
Original: French

Third Committee

Summary record of the 54th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 24 November 2004, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Kuchinsky ..... (Ukraine)

Contents

Agenda item 105 : Human rights questions *(continued)*

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives *(continued)*

(e) Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights *(continued)*

Revitalization of the work of the Third Committee

Programme of work for the Third Committee at the sixtieth session

Achievements of the work of the Third Committee

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

04-62301 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 105: Human rights questions *(continued)*

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives *(continued)* (A/C.3/59/L.46, A/C.3/59/L.48* and A/C.3/59/L.54)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.46 : Situation of human rights in Zimbabwe.

1. **The Chairman** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications, and that Iceland and Turkey had become sponsors.

2. **Mr. van den Berg** (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the human rights situation in Zimbabwe this year clearly justified its status as the subject of the proposed draft resolution. The text had been formulated in a balanced way and had taken account of the difficult situation the country was in.

3. **Mr. Montwedi** (South Africa), speaking on a point of order in his capacity as coordinator of the Group of African States, officially moved to adjourn debate on the draft resolution, in accordance with Article 116 of the Internal Regulations of the General Assembly. The African group rejected the way the multilateral institutions of the United Nations were being diverted for the purposes of settling bilateral disputes. It also deplored the double standards applied by the European Union, which gave the impression that human rights violations only occurred in developing countries. This was a direct affront to the integrity of African political leadership. The intransigent nature of country-specific resolutions made them counterproductive, and they were contrary to the spirit of cooperation that was essential in resolving human rights problems in different countries.

4. **Mr. Choi** (Australia), raising a point of order, said that as South Africa had moved to adjourn debate on the draft resolution, invoking Article 116 of the Internal Regulations of the General Assembly, application of the said article required that a vote be immediately taken on the motion. The South African delegation should not therefore be making a general statement.

5. **Mr. Montwedi** (South Africa), having been given leave by the Chairman to continue his justification for the adjournment proposal, stated that by presenting such a conflictive text, the European Union was merely naming and shaming developing countries. It had also succeeded in corrupting the spirit of the Commission on Human Rights and the Third Committee, and had derailed the latter from its mandate to cooperate constructively with States in order to eliminate human rights violations. The confrontational approach adopted by the European Union to further its political aims could obviously only serve to divert the Committee from its noble purpose. Lastly, by acting in this way, the European Union had also clearly revealed the existence of a policy of double standards by targeting developing countries only.

6. The Group of African States believed that the adoption of resolutions focusing on the human rights situation in a specific country, such as those sponsored by the European Union and their developed-country partners, represented the greatest possible risk the Commission on Human Rights could run in exercising its mandate. With the draft resolution on Zimbabwe, the European Union had once again perverted work devoted to human rights, in an attempt to justify the disrespect shown by certain of its members for the bilateral agreements they had concluded or the obligations that were incumbent upon them. As the countries of the group believed that the problems listed in the draft resolution should be resolved on a bilateral basis by the countries concerned, they rejected the proposed text in its entirety, in keeping with the position they had adopted in the last three meetings of the Commission on Human Rights, during which the European Union had made three unsuccessful attempts to get a similar text adopted.

7. **Mr. Cumberbach Miguén** (Cuba) announced that the Cuban delegation would vote in favour of the adjournment motion, in keeping with its policy of support for the African nations, since country-specific draft resolutions were of little use, and could only aggravate the confrontation between developed and third-world countries on the issue of human rights. Those who had tolerated and sustained the apartheid regime in southern Africa, and had bequeathed as a sad

heritage the problem of inequitable land distribution in Zimbabwe, had no right to pose as judges now.

8. **Ms. Astanah Banu** (Malaysia), recalled that, following their third summit in Kuala Lumpur and the fourteenth ministerial conference held in Durban (South Africa), member countries of the Non-Aligned Movement had argued that human rights questions should be addressed globally and through constructive dialogue, without interference in the internal affairs of individual States, and taking account of the multiple political, historical, social, religious and cultural components of each country. It was deplorable that certain States continued to pose as self-proclaimed defenders of human rights in the world, while adopting a selective approach that was clearly politically motivated. She therefore felt bound to vote in favour of the motion proposed by South Africa.

9. **Mr. Choi** (Australia), bitterly regretting that an adjournment motion had been proposed, reiterated his delegation's view that any text submitted to the Third Committee should be discussed and lead to a decision, and that delegations should be able to state their points of view on the substance of any text proposed. Australia was therefore opposed to any adjournment motion as a matter of principle. With regard to questions raised by certain parties as to the partiality and selectivity of country-specific texts, the Australian delegation preferred to stress the gravity of the human rights situation in Zimbabwe, which urgently required the Commission's attention and justified the delegations' spending time debating it. The speaker drew attention to the policies pursued by the Zimbabwean authorities, which continued to impoverish the population, and the fact that it was still impossible to hold free and fair elections in Zimbabwe, because of the restrictions imposed on freedom of opinion and expression. He emphasized that there was irrefutable evidence of persecution, and that acts of intimidation and torture had been perpetrated against opponents of the regime. In view of this situation, any obstacle placed in the way of examining the issue in its proper perspective, would reduce the role and mandate of the Third Committee to naught. The speaker announced that Australia would therefore vote against the adjournment motion, and called on other delegations to do likewise.

10. **Mr. van den Berg** (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said firstly that member countries of the Union tended on principle to vote against any motion to adjourn debate on an agenda item, since no country whatsoever should be able to evade an examination of its human rights situation by the international mechanisms established to protect such rights.

11. Referring to the second, third, and fourth lines of the preamble, and paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 of the draft resolution, the speaker said that nothing could excuse the serious violations that had occurred in Zimbabwe. It was therefore important to debate the text of the draft, if only to send a message to Zimbabwean civil society that the international community was aware of its distress and was concerned about it.

12. Adoption of the proposed adjournment motion would once again undermine the principles of transparency and freedom of expression that were essential to the Committee's work, and at the very least hinder examination of the elements contained in the resolution. Following the reverse suffered in April 2004 before the Commission on Human Rights, the representative of the Netherlands said that it was even more important that the Third Committee should debate all draft resolutions brought before it, without exception and in their proper perspective. He concluded by calling on delegations, regardless of how they intended to vote on the text of the draft as such, to vote against a motion to adjourn debate that could only jeopardize the spirit of dialogue that everyone supported.

13. *A recorded vote was taken on the motion to adjourn debate on the draft resolution.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Myanmar,

Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Vietnam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palaos, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Brazil, Colombia, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago.

14. *The motion to adjourn debate on the draft resolution was adopted by 92 votes to 72, with 9 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.48 : Situation of human rights in Sudan*

15. **The Chairman** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications, and that Japan, Liechtenstein and Monaco had joined as sponsors. Moldova, however, had asked to be withdrawn from the list of sponsors.

16. **Mr. van den Berg** (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the human rights situation in Sudan merited consideration by the Third Committee.

17. **Mr. Montwedi** (South Africa), speaking on a point of order in his capacity as coordinator of the Group of African States, officially moved to adjourn debate on the draft resolution, in accordance with Article 116 of the Internal Regulations of the General Assembly. He made clear that the Group did not seek to deny the existence of human rights violations on the African continent, but merely to counter the double standards employed by the European Union. Through this motion, like the previous one on draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.46 concerning Zimbabwe, the Group was reiterating its outright rejection of any country-specific resolution, which contributed nothing to the spirit of cooperation that should always motivate the work of the United Nations. Such texts did nothing to foster cooperation from the countries targeted, which was crucial if the aim was to solve human rights problems, and they only served to exacerbate existing tensions. In view of the initiatives currently underway in Sudan, the Group saw absolutely no reason to burden the Committee with a preventive text such as that contained in the draft resolution, and that the sponsors, motivated by a spirit of hostility, were seriously undermining not only the top-level structures of the African continent, but also international mechanisms tasked with find a lasting solution for Sudan. The wording of the draft resolution showed that the sponsors were questioning the capacities and integrity of mechanisms currently operating in Sudan, before these had even submitted their first report. Referring to the meeting of the Security Council held in Nairobi during the previous week, and the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the Sudanese Government and Popular Liberation Movement of Sudan, committing the two parties to conclude and sign a comprehensive peace agreement by 31 December 2004, and noting their willingness to cooperate, the speaker claimed that the European Union was nullifying these efforts through its draft resolution.

18. **Ms. Faye** (Senegal) stated that she fully supported the adjournment motion proposed by the South African delegation.

19. **Ms. Astanah Banu** (Malaysia), again referred to the declarations made by Heads of State and Government of the non-aligned countries to the effect

that "Human rights issues should be addressed globally and in a constructive manner, based on dialogue and guided by principles of objectivity, respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, impartiality, non-selectivity and transparency"; and that "human rights should not be exploited for political purposes, for example by targeting certain countries on a selective basis, sometimes motivated by considerations other than human rights, contrary to the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter." She stated that her delegation was opposed to any draft resolution that was country-specific, and announced that she would therefore support the motion by the Group of African countries to adjourn debate on the draft resolution.

20. **Mr. Scott** (United States of America) said that, unless the international community was united in its actions to resolve problems in Sudan, the Sudanese population would continue to suffer.

21. Referring to the commitment made by the warring parties, at the aforementioned Nairobi meeting, to end the conflict between the north and south of Sudan by 31 December 2004, he noted that while the international community had promised support for the country, it had also called for an immediate cessation of the atrocities being committed in Darfur. The American delegation therefore believed that by refusing to debate the draft resolution on Sudan and the human rights situation in that country, the Third Committee would be revealed as weak and lacking in vision, and it would also be taking risks. This would be further evidence of an indefensible parochialism, following the adoption by the Commission on Human Rights at its annual meeting in the spring of 2004 of a resolution on Sudan whose timorous text failed to vigorously denounce the most egregious human rights violations in the world today, and Sudan's re-election to the Commission on Human Rights in May 2004, against which the United States had protested by walking out of the meeting of the Economic and Social Council. By failing, for a third time, to present a united front against atrocities that were known to have been committed in Darfur, the international community would be signalling the complete breakdown of the United Nations deliberative bodies responsible for protecting human rights. In contrast, over the last two months alone, the Security Council had achieved a peace accord, exerted constant pressure on the warring parties, and set up a commission of inquiry to investigate human rights violations.

22. In its conviction that the adoption of a motion to adjourn debate on the draft resolution ran the risk of aborting ongoing processes to restore peace to Sudan, and that responsible nations could not stay silent but had to act when their neighbours were not only repressing freedom, but actually indulging in a crime against humanity, the United States appealed to all who placed any value on human rights to vote against such a motion.

23. **Mr. van den Berg** (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Union, repeated that no country, large or small, could exempt themselves from surveillance by international mechanisms for the defence of human rights. The motion to adjourn debate on the draft resolution would be nothing less than an attempt to evade such vigilance. The European Union was convinced of the need to focus on the human rights situation in Sudan, as it had made clear on numerous occasions in the Third Committee, particularly during the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

24. After referring to paragraph 2 (a), (b) and (c), paragraph 3 (b), and paragraph 4 (a) of the draft resolution, the speaker said that as the General Assembly was the only United Nations body of universal composition concerned with human rights, it had an obligation to address the most serious human rights situations, including those taking place in Sudan, and it consequently had a duty to examine any text brought before it on the subject.

25. On the issue of strengthening the role of the General Assembly vis-à-vis the Security Council in the framework of reform of the Organization, the speaker remarked that just because the Security Council was concerned about the situation in Sudan, as it should be in its capacity as the leading United Nations body with responsibility for peace and security issues, this should not prevent the Assembly from expressing itself on the human rights situation in Darfur and in Sudan. He therefore appealed to delegations to vote against the motion to adjourn debate, partly on principle, but also to prevent the General Assembly from becoming irrelevant.

26. *A recorded vote was taken on the motion to adjourn debate on the draft resolution.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palaos, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor Leste, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Namibia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago.

27. *The motion to adjourn debate on the draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 74, with 11 abstentions.*

Draft Resolution A/C.3/59/L.54 : Situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

28. **The Chairman** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications, and that the Republic of Moldova had asked to be withdrawn from the list of sponsors.

29. **Ms. Bakker** (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Union and all sponsors of the draft resolution, announced that Albania and Liechtenstein were joining as sponsors. She then read out the amendments made to draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.54, following consultations held in an amicable climate of mutual respect. Such amendments proved that it was possible to reach consensus on a country-specific draft resolution. The representative from the Netherlands regretted that it had not been possible to take the concerns expressed by certain delegations more fully into account, notably as regards the preamble of the text, and that a consensus had not been reached. She recalled that following the presentation of the draft resolution, the European Union had taken the view that in view of the serious human rights violations committed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, especially in the eastern part of the country, on which the Independent Expert had reported to the Third Committee, the international community could not remain silent. The draft resolution was testimony both to the concern of the international community and to its support for the ongoing process.

30. **Ms. Zack** (United States of America) proposed an amendment to paragraph 7 (g) of draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.54, in relation to the International Criminal Court, i.e. paragraph 6 (g) of the revised text. The amended paragraph would read as follows:

"To hold those who are responsible for violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, and for crimes against humanity, accountable for their

actions before the competent national and international judicial mechanisms."

31. **Ms. Dakker** (Netherlands) stated that the European Union and the sponsors of the draft resolution were fervent supporters of the International Criminal Court and of cooperation between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the court; they would therefore be voting against the proposed amendment and urged other delegations to the same.

32. **Ms. Zack** (United States) clarified that the proposed amendment occurred in paragraph 6 (f) of the revised text, and not in paragraph 6 (g) as she had originally stated.

33. **Mr. Mukongo Ngay** (Democratic Republic of the Congo), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, pointed out that his country was a party to the Rome Statue for the International Criminal Court, and noted that the court was currently working in the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to investigate the crimes that had been committed there. The Democratic Republic of the Congo supported the International Criminal Court and would vote against the proposed amendment.

34. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment to paragraph 6 (f) of the draft resolution, as amended.*

In favour:

Palaos, United States of America.

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, China, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania.

35. *The amendment to paragraph 6 (f) of the draft resolution was rejected by 116 votes to 2, with 38 abstentions.*

36. **The Chairman** announced that a recorded vote had been requested on the third and fourth lines of the preamble and on paragraph 6 of the amended text. In reply to a question by the representative of Cuba, he stated that the two lines and the paragraph in question would be voted on separately.

37. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) read out the lines and paragraph to be voted on, in order to avoid any ambiguity between document A/C.3/59/L.54 and the document containing the final amendments dated 22 November 2004, which had been circulated to the delegations.

38. **Mr. Mukongo Ngay** (Democratic Republic of the Congo) asked the Chairman which delegation had requested a recorded vote on the two lines and paragraph.

39. **The Chairman** replied Uganda had requested the recorded vote.

40. **Ms. Bakker** (Netherlands) stated that the sponsors of the draft resolution would vote to maintain the third line of the preamble.

41. **Ms. Otiti** (Uganda), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that her explanation referred to the two lines and the paragraph in question. Her delegation deplored the fact that the draft resolution took no account of progress made and efforts deployed in the region, notably the declaration of principles adopted at the International Conference on Peace, Security, Democracy and Development in the Great Lakes Region, held in Dar-es-Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) on 19 and 20 November 2004. By referring to later documents based on rumours and unverified allegations, the draft resolution had lost all credibility and had cast a shadow over positive developments that are being verified on the ground. Uganda's participation in peace processes in the Great Lakes region was aimed exclusively at establishing peace and security; and any insinuation that it was party to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was not only incomprehensible and unfounded, but also unacceptable. At the present time, the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was exclusively internal, and Uganda had only intervened at the behest of the President of that country who had appealed for its assistance in bringing an end to the conflict, notably in the eastern part of the country. The manoeuvrings of the sponsors of the draft resolution would not prevent Uganda from persevering with efforts to improve the situation in the region, nor should other countries in the region be discouraged from doing likewise. Desirous of reaching a consensus on that draft resolution, the Ugandan delegation had participated in the negotiations with complete transparency and in a spirit of cooperation, doing everything in its power to achieve the objective. The speaker regretted that such attempts had foundered, and she hoped that subsequent resolutions on the issue would look to the future and recognize the encouraging events that have occurred in the Great Lakes region. For that reason, the Ugandan delegation had asked for separate votes on the third and fourth lines of the preamble, and on the whole of paragraph 6 of the amended text, and would vote against each of the lines and the paragraph, and also against the draft resolution as a whole.

42. **Mr. Mukongo Ngay** (Democratic Republic of the Congo), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, pointed out that as the draft resolution concerned the Democratic Republic of the Congo and not Uganda, he was astonished that the text was more of a problem for Uganda, as if that country acknowledged having committed the serious human rights violations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo of which he accused it. Clarifying that the explanation of the vote on the third line of the preamble applied to all the lines and the paragraph to be voted upon, he announced that his delegation would vote to maintain them, since they were extremely important. The importance of the third line of the preamble stemmed from the fact that it established a link between the past and present, whereas Uganda probably wanted a vacuum. The Democratic Republic of the Congo would vote to maintain the line in question, and it called on all peace-loving States to do likewise.

43. *A registered vote was taken on the third line of the preamble.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palaos, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Rwanda, Uganda.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

44. *The third line of the preamble was maintained by 101 votes to 2, with 61 abstentions.*

45. *A recorded vote was taken on the fourth line of the preamble.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palaos, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Rwanda, Uganda.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

46. *The fourth line of the preamble was maintained by 100 votes to 2, with 61 abstentions.*

47. **Mr. Nyamulinda** (Rwanda), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, thanked the delegation of the Netherlands and the European Union for the open spirit displayed throughout the consultations, and deplored the fact that they had failed to reach consensus on the draft resolution.

48. **Ms. Groux** (Switzerland), speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairman to clarify once again that the vote related to paragraph 6 of the text and not the draft resolution as a whole.

49. **The Chairman** confirmed that the vote related to paragraph 6 of the text, as amended.

50. **Mr. Nyamulinda** (Rwanda) stated that he had misunderstood, and withdrew the explanation of his vote, focusing exclusively on paragraph 6 of the text, as amended. He stated that his delegation would vote

against maintaining that paragraph, because by addressing all parties to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and citing Rwanda by name in line (b), it insinuated that Rwanda was a party to the conflict. His country had not intervened in the conflict in question, however, or in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was an internal matter, and ought not to be used to attack other countries in the region.

51. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6 of the text, as amended.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palaos, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Rwanda, Uganda.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

52. *Paragraph 6 of the text, as amended, was maintained by 93 votes to 2, with 67 abstentions.*

53. **The Chairman** announced that a recorded vote would be taken on draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.54 as a whole, as amended.

54. **Mr. Nyamulinda** (Rwanda), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, announced that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution as a whole, since it failed to take account of reality and the new dynamic existing on the ground. In the third and fourth lines of the preamble, the draft resolution referred to resolutions that had been signed in the context of conflicts that had ravaged the Great Lakes region several years earlier. Such resolutions had often been presented for political reasons and lacked objectivity; their aim was to find scapegoats rather than seek the true causes of the current human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The draft resolution also failed to mention the human rights violations committed by the former Armed Forces of Rwanda and the Interahamwe militiamen, who had been responsible for genocide in Rwanda, and by other armed groups, when these were the origin of all the ills inflicted on the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Rwanda would nonetheless continue to spare no effort to re-establish peace, stability and security in the Great Lakes region, and called upon the sponsors of the draft resolution in the future to recognize the new dynamic in the region and to frame their text in a logic of reconciliation both within and between the States of the region.

55. **Mr. Mukongo Ngay** (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said the occupation of the eastern part of his country, which had lasted for five years, had been marked by massive, systematic and documented violations of the rules of international humanitarian law and human rights, resulting in the death of around 3.5 million people. Nonetheless, it was no exaggeration to claim that the peace process in his country had progressed well since the conclusion of the Global and All-Inclusive agreement signed in Pretoria on 17 December 2002, and the establishment of a Government of national unity and transition.

56. Although violence and insecurity persisted, particularly in the east of the country, one could reasonably claim that peace and reconciliation, national unity, reconstruction, economic recovery and development were on track. In that context, the Congolese delegation saw strengthening of the rule of law as one of the main challenges to be overcome, in order to break the cycle of violence, put an end to impunity, combat one of the underlying causes of the conflict which had ruined the country, and lay definitive foundations for a genuinely democratic society in DRC. Consequently, the necessary reconciliation in the Great Lakes region required that the crimes committed be brought to light, responsibilities apportioned and justice provided to the victims.

57. The speaker referred to resolution 2004/84 of the Commission on Human Rights whereby the Commission had changed its strategy for examining the human rights situation in DRC, resulting in the appointment on 26 July 2004 of an independent expert with a mandate better suited to current needs for re-establishing the rule of law and justice administration in the country. It was essential that the draft resolution took account of the dynamic of the new mandate entrusted to that expert.

58. That did not seem to have been a concern of the European Union and other sponsors of the draft resolution, who drew their inspiration from previous resolutions and continued to point the finger of accusation at the transitional government, at a time when it urgently needed help in strengthening its capacities in the justice domain. The fact that this was widely recognized was a paradox that indicated either a lack of genuine willingness to help DRC, or else a culpable failure to understand the Independent Expert's new mandate. One could not demand superhuman efforts from the Government, which would be beyond the capacity of stable State in normal times, to promote justice, peace and democracy in a land rendered fragile by five years of war. The speaker was particularly mindful of the thinly veiled injunctions to the Government of national unity and transition contained in paragraph 6 (d) and (e) of the draft resolution. The Congolese delegation made clear that its government had always acknowledged the dilapidated state of its judicial system, just as it realized that it was impossible to wage an effective fight against impunity in such conditions. The Democratic Republic of the Congo was more determined than ever to establish and maintain a fair, reliable, moral and effective justice system, in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law. That was also the aim of the ongoing reform of the justice system, which, nonetheless was coming up against the problems that new democracies often faced. The speaker believed that in the current context of resource scarcity, compromised security, and a population traumatized by five years of war, instead of issuing injunctions to its Government, the European Union ought to have proposed strengthening the mechanism for assisting his country, since no State on its own can face the multiple challenges of establishing justice and respect for the rule of law in a transition society. Rather, the issue depended on shared responsibility between the State and the international community.

59. With reference to paragraph 6 (e) of the draft text, the speaker observed that the issue of abolition of the death penalty was also within the framework of justice system reform, the success of which depended on resources and assistance provided by the international community. The issue of capital punishment should have been the subject of an in-depth study by the national parliament, which is the only body empowered to decide whether it should be maintained or abolished. Congolese public opinion still believed in the death penalty, especially for cases of attempted murder. Moreover, given the current state of prison infrastructure in DRC it was unlikely that a criminal found guilty of an offence otherwise punishable by the death penalty would fully serve the alternative sentence. The path to abolition should therefore be matched by an improvement in prison policy and administration. The representative recalled that his government had established a moratorium on the death penalty, which although suspended, remained in force in the sense that Congolese jurisdictions confined

themselves to pronouncing the death penalty without actually executing it.

60. Referring to paragraph 6 (j) of the draft resolution, the speaker recalled that the pillage of natural resources in DRC was being orchestrated by elements that were fomenting conflict in the country, who in profiting from the activity, had become world exporters of materials that they did not produce; he was referring here to Rwanda and Uganda. If DRC had been left in ruins, it was because neighbouring countries had sown desolation and violence and systematically pillaged its economic resources, as attested by the overwhelmingly damning reports filed by the panel of experts appointed by the Security Council on this subject. The speaker therefore considered that it was those countries should have been directly addressed when inserting a line in paragraph 5 of the draft text. Paragraph 6 (j) was unacceptable to the Congolese delegation because it accused the Congolese government of illegally exploiting its own wealth.

61. The draft resolution would not have made any sense if it had fully conformed to the recommendations made by Independent Expert appointed by the Commission on Human Rights, notably the creation of an International Criminal Tribunal by DRC, without renouncing reform of its judicial system, at a time when the International Criminal Court had begun to investigate the serious crimes committed in the country. The Congolese delegation considered that crimes committed before 1 July 2002, which fell outside the jurisdiction of ICC, could not go unpunished; but it would be impossible to put an end to such acts until the international community agreed to support an International Criminal Tribunal for DRC, capable of prosecuting and punishing the perpetrators. This was the thrust of the appeal made by the Congolese President from the platform of the General Assembly on 24 September 2003. Letting crimes go unpunished risked compromising national reconciliation and the advent of the rule of law in DRC.

62. The speaker announced that his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution and urged all other delegations to do likewise.

63. **Mr. Cardoso** (Brazil) recalled that his delegation had expressed doubts to the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly about resolutions on country-specific human rights situations, because they failed to benefit the people they were intended to protect. For that reason Brazil had proposed that the Commission on Human Rights should establish a global report on the human rights situation around the world, and had supported a strengthening of thematic mechanisms. The Brazilian delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution, while noting that it drew attention to progress made on certain aspects of human rights, notably implementation of the Global and All-Inclusive agreement.

64. *A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.*

.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palaos, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor Leste, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Rwanda, Uganda.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's

Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

65. *The draft resolution was adopted by 72 votes to 2, with 94 abstentions.**

66. **Ms. Zack** (United States of America), explaining her delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution, said that her country remained concerned about continuing violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in DRC, and recalled that during the last 10 years, successive wars in that country had cost the lives of some 3 million civilians; sexual violence was rampant; and countless detainees were being held without due process. The United States supported the calls for all parties in the conflict to put an end to violence, and it joined other countries in demanding that the government of national unity and transition respect the obligations incumbent upon it under international instruments relating to human rights, and put an end to impunity. The speaker recalled her country's reservations towards the International Criminal Court, but said that those who were guilty of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law should be prosecuted in the appropriate national and international courts.

67. **Mr. Degia** (Barbados), explaining his delegation's abstention in the vote on paragraph 6 (f) of the amended draft text, pointed out that although his country was party to the Rome Statute for the International Criminal Court, it was opposed to any country-specific resolution.

68. **The Chairman** moved that the Committee take note of the following reports, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488:

On agenda item 105 (c):

Note from the Secretary General transmitting the report of the Independent Expert of the Commission on Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan (A/59/370);

Note from the Secretary General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on violations of international humanitarian law and human rights committed in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 (A/59/256);

Note from the Secretary General transmitting the report of the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights concerning the situation of human rights in Sierra Leone (A/59/340);

Oral report of the Independent Expert responsible for the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, presented at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee;

Oral report of the Special Rapporteur responsible for studying the situation of human rights in the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, presented at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee;

Oral report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Sudan, presented at the thirtieth meeting of the Committee.

On agenda item 105 (e):

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/59/36).

69. *There being no objection, it was so decided.*

70. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to consider the issue of revitalization of its work and drew its attention to document A/C.3/59/CRP.1/ Rev.1.

71. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) read out the amendments made to the abovementioned document. Below the title of the document, "Revitalization of the work of the Third Committee", it was proposed to add the following text: "Recalling General Assembly resolutions 58/126 of 19 December 2003 and 58/316 of 1 July 2004 on the revitalisation of

* The bolivian delegation subsequently informed the Committee that instead of abstaining it wished to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

the work of the General Assembly, the Third Committee approves the text related to its work contained in the annex to the present document." In the annex to paragraph 3 (a), the last sentence should be replaced by the following: "The Secretariat is requested to provide the Third Committee with a list of participants prior to the debates, in order to facilitate delegations' preparations for the question time." In paragraph 3 (b), the final sentence should be replaced by the following: "Interactive debates shall be organized in consultation with Member States."

72. **Ms. Astanah Banu** (Malaysia), Vice-Chairman, presented document A/C.3/59/CRP.1/Rev.1, entitled "Revitalization of the Work of the Third Committee", in response to the demand expressed in General Assembly resolution 58/316. She applauded the fact that the Third Committee had been able to submit the conclusions of its work on this subject well before the deadline set in the General Assembly resolution. She made clear that adoption of the document did not signify the end of the process, and that the Committee had to oversee fulfilment of the document's recommendations by each Member State, by herself, by the Secretariat and by all parties involved. Moreover, the Committee would have to help integrate the contents of that document into a text for adoption by General Assembly regarding the follow-up to resolution 58/316. The Vice-Chairman asked Member States to immediately implement the recommendations contained in the document.

73. There being no objection, the Chairman would transmit the recommendations contained in document A/C.3/59/CRP.1/Rev.1 to the President of the General Assembly, for analysis by the General Assembly in plenary session.

74. *It was so decided.*

75. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to consider its work programme for the sixtieth session of the General Assembly, and drew attention to document A/C.3/59/CRP.2.

76. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) read out the amendments made to the abovementioned document. In item 6, entitled "Advancement of women", the following would be added at the end: "In depth study on violence against women." The title of item 9 "Programme of activity of the international decade of indigenous peoples (1995-2004)" was altered to "Indigenous issues". In item 4, "Crime prevention and criminal justice", the entry entitled "United Nations Congress for crime prevention and criminal justice" would be eliminated.

77. **Ms. Carvalho** (Portugal), referring to item 2, commented that the phrase "World Programme of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyond" after "Policies and programmes involving youth", should be eliminated, since it was the title used in the General Assembly resolutions. She asked for that amendment to be taken into account in the document.

78. **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan), referring to item 2 and the entry entitled "Family", asked whether this was the precise title, or whether something was missing.

79. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), replied that in document A/58/509, the title of the point in question was indeed "Family", and that the issue had to be examined in odd years.

80. There being no objection, the provisional work programme of the Third Committee was adopted, and would be transmitted to the President of the General Assembly for analysis by the Assembly in plenary session.

81. *It was so decided.*

82. **Ms. Kusorgbor** (Ghana), Vice-Chairman, reported on consultations held on the definition of criteria governing future invitations to special rapporteurs, independent experts and chairpersons of work groups of the Special Procedures of the Commission on Human Rights. Delegations clearly needed more time to reflect on those criteria, so it had been proposed to report on the examination of that issue at the sixtieth session of the General Assembly.

83. There being no objection, the Committee would re-examine the question of criteria governing invitations to individuals in the framework of the Special Procedures of the Commission on Human Rights at its sixtieth session.

84. *It was so decided.*

85. **The Chairman** recalled the content of General Assembly resolution 58/126, and in particular the fact that the bureaus of the main committees were fully elected three months in advance of the forthcoming session; accordingly, the Committee would meet in due course to elect a new bureau. The Chairman stated that the Third Committee had completed its work for this part of the fifty-ninth session.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.